III, 3. - THE CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN GROSSETESTE'S QUOTATIONS FROM THE LATIN TRANSLATION OF THE PHYSICS AND THE GREEK TEXT

It is the merit of Dr Dales to have identified the version of the *Physics* used by Grosseteste ; it is that found in MS *Vatican Urbinat. lat. 206* (1). In an appendix to his edition of the *Commentary on the Physics,* Dales has reproduced from this MS all the elements of text which were quoted by Grosseteste in his notes and comments (2). Alongside these he has printed the actual quotations from the *Physics,* as found in the three surviving MSS of Grosseteste's *Commentary.*

My purpose here is to offer an essential aid to the study of the notes on the *Physics,* by providing references to the Greek text for each element of the *Physics* commented or quoted by Grosseteste in the course of his note-writing. I also wish to offer a few remarks upon what can be gleaned from the comparison thus instituted, by way of fuller understanding of Grosseteste's working-methods and appreciation of his use of the translation.

A glance at the appendix to Dales's edition confirms, if confirmation were needed, the very corrupt state of the three extant MSS of the commentary of Grosseteste. On eight occasions only do the three witnesses attest literal agreement with each other and with the Vatican MS ; and in each case the quotation in question is a brief one, consisting of only a few words. For the most part, the divergences are both frequent and wide. Even between *M* and *V*, which are of the same family, substantial differences exist (3). In the early books *D* represents a somewhat better text of the quotations and approximates more closely to the Vatican MS than do *M, V*. Its fidelity should not however be exaggerated, even as a witness to the text of the first half of the commentary ; while after bk. IV it can be accorded no privileged status by comparison with *M, V*. Clearly, if the textual tradition of the quotations from the *Physics* is bad, that of the notes which accompany them cannot be expected to be much superior in quality.

The tracing of the quotations of the Latin version back to the Greek text presents few problems which are not soluble by patient searching, because the extremely literal character of the translation, in addition perhaps to the fact that it derived directly from the Greek without the intermediary of Arabic, makes for easy identification of correspondences. One such problem, however, is that a few texts prove to be out

(1) R. C. DALES, ed. *Roberti Grosseteste, Episcopi Lincolniensis, Commentarius in VIII Libros Physicorum Aristotelis...* Boulder, Colorado, 1963, xxxiii+ 192 pp. ; p. xxxii. See the review of Dales's edition in Bibl. Franc. (Rome) XII, n. 1364.

(2) Ibid., pp. 161-183.

(3) *D, M* and *V* are the abbreviations employed by Dales to refer to the three extant MSS containing Grosseteste's notes : Oxford, *Digby 220,* fols 84^{a}-105^{a} ; Oxford, *Merton 295,* 120^{a}-145^{a} ; and Venice, *S. Marco* VI.222, fols 2^{a}-30^{c}. All three were known to Thomson (*The Writings of Robert Grosseteste, Bishop of Lincoln 1235-1253,* Cambridge 1940, p. 82).

of sequence in respect of those immediately preceding and following them. Such is the case of the quotation on p. 46, line 10 (4), which corresponds to 197b 22 in the Greek text, but is preceded by a comment on 198a 9-10, and followed by a quotation from 198a 10-11, so that the sequence of the texts is upset. The note on '*vanum*' (46.10-24) should have intervened on p. 44, between the thirteenth and the fourteenth propositions, where it would have adhered to the sequence of Aristotle's text. It could however be the case that Grosseteste deliberately chose not to place it there because it would have interrupted his treatment of *fortuna* and *casus*, themes which quite obviously interested him greatly because they touched upon the doctrine of providence, which he discussed in a highly personal way from 45.5 to 46.9.

Similarly on page 127.8-10 two texts of Aristotle are inverted: they are 245b 3-4, and 244a 8-9. It would seem that 245b 3-4 is in place here, since it is introduced by the word '*quarto*' (127.7), replying to *3°* (126.27), and *2°* (126.1). But if this is so, then the quotation from 244a 8-9 and the relevant comment are misplaced. More curiously still, the comment includes two quotations which regress even further back in the text of the *Physics*, namely 243a 17-18, and 243b 8 (or 11 — it is too short to allow a decision); and it ends with a phrase which I have not been able to trace (127.22-3), but which is not present in the relevant section of the Greek text. Clearly the order of this passage presents a problem, for which a satisfactory solution in terms of the content or the context is not apparent.

The opening lines of bk VIII constitute, contrary to Grosseteste's usual practice, a summary of the whole book, consisting of a series of texts (or paraphrases) in which the six basic propositions of bk VIII are set forth (131.1 - 132.1). The notes then recommence (132.2) at the beginning of the book, and continue in the usual orderly fashion up to 144.28, the last text of the *Physics* commented being 258a 27-28. From this point onward the character of the discussion changes, the theme of the perpetuity of motion is the only one treated of, and the Prague MS containing the *De Finitate Motus et Temporis* commences (5). The initial summary of contents of bk VIII is out of place only in the sense that it marks a departure from Grosseteste's normal practice.

Our first conclusion must then be, that these notes and comments which we possess on the *Physics* follow the order of the Greek text almost perfectly, with only one, or at the most two, deviations. We are justified in concluding that, if the *Commentary* in its present form is a posthumous compilation of Grosseteste's notes made up from *marginalia* and scraps of parchment inserted in his copy of the *Physics* (6), its editor, working no doubt towards the close of the thirteenth century, and probably in the Franciscan convent at Oxford (7), respected the order

(4) All references to Grosseteste's *Commentary* are to Dales's edition. The first number of a reference indicates the page, the second unit the line or lines.
(5) Prague MS, *Národní Mus.*, XII.E.5.
(6) Dales, *op. cit.*, pp. XII-XIII.
(7) Scotus is the earliest writer known to have consulted the *Commentary*.

of the various notes and kept his intervention to the minimum necessary to produce a consecutive text.

A further conclusion suggested by our inquiry is that the *Commentary* and the related treatise *De Finitate Motus et Temporis* differ in their manner of referring to the translation of Aristotle, and belong to different *genres*. Quotations found in the *Commentary* as a whole are taken directly from the Latin translation of the *Physics*. On the other hand, the tracing of four apparent quotations occurring in the *De Finitate* revealed that in one case only (152.20-21) was the phrase in question an actual quotation (252b 5-6) ; the other three proved to be paraphrases, corresponding to certain texts of bk VIII of the *Physics* :

148.13-14 = 151a 17-20
149. 9-20 = 250b 11
151.20-21 = (' the instant is the continuation of the past and the future ') = 251b 20-22 : however, this is an Aristotelean commonplace ; as Grosseteste formulates it, it is perhaps closest to 222a 10 ; but cf. 218a 8-9, 220a 4-5 and 223a 6.

The form of correspondence manifested between the Latin and Greek in these three texts is not that of translation, but rather that of paraphrase or reminiscence. Grosseteste had, we conclude, certain of the key texts of Aristotle in mind as he summarised and criticised the three arguments in favour of the perpetuity of motion ; but only in one case did he look up the actual text in the translation, whereas it had been his practice throughout the *Commentary on the Physics* to quote in a very exact manner from the Aristotelean text. This difference in the manner of quoting betrays the different intentions present in the two works. In the *De Finitate* Grosseteste felt himself less bound to the text of Aristotle and more free to advance his own views, to re-state the Stagirite's arguments, and to criticise these as a Christian believer. As Dales remarks, the *De Finitate* was not intended as part of the *Commentary*, rather it possesses a unity and purpose of its own (8). This conclusion is reinforced by our examination.

The most important result aimed at in a comparison of the Latin version used by Grosseteste with the Greek original is, of course, an assessment of the quality of the translation judged from the point of view of its accuracy. Al full-scale investigation of this problem would involve the detailed comparison of the Vatican MS with the Greek text, but it is sufficient for our purpose here that such passages as are actually cited by Grosseteste and used by him as a basis of commentary be judged as to their reliability, so that we may see whether and to what extent they misled the commentator.

Four passages from the *Commentary* demand scrutiny in this regard.

(8) Ibid., p. xii.

(1) 5.24 (= 184b 11). All four Mss give the reading '*diffinitum*' in this brief phrase; it is therefore not a simple variant. The Greek text has however ἀδιορίστῶς (with a variant ἄδιορίστον); clearly, the translator has omitted to render the privative α. The effects of this error are not catastrophic; Grosseteste's comment on the question is brief (5.24-27), and does not depend upon the word in question.

(2) 5.28-29 (= 184 b 20-22). *M, V,* and *D* all read '*plura*', but the Vatican MS has '*plura infinita*', a redundancy accounted for by the context. The Greek text reads ἀπείρους, so that *M, V, D* are quite inexact. Grosseteste follows them in his brief commentary, which in consequence loses the point of Aristotle's disjunction: either the principles are finite in number, or they are infinite in number.

(3) 43.25-26 (197a 5-6). All four MSS have '*in minori*', where the Greek text reads κατὰ προαίρεσιν; evidently a considerable mistake. Grosseteste, however, having quoted the text, passes on immediately to another point.

(4) 61.9 (204b 3-4). Unfortunately the editor has not given us enough of the text to enable us to judge whether or not the words '*in actu*', which Grosseteste seems to consider part of the text of Aristotle, occur in the translation which he used. The Greek text at this point has ἐπὶ τὴν αὔξησιν; the abbreviation of '*augmentum*' *or* '*augmento*' may have given rise to our '*actu*', but it is possible also that this text should be placed in relation to that quoted in 66.6-8 (206a 7-10), where in a similar phrase ('*actu corpus non sit infinitum*'), '*actu*' occurs, this time correctly. Confusion becomes worse confounded, however, when we find that in this commentary on the latter text (66.8ff.), Grosseteste states: '*ostenso quod non est corpus infinitum in augmento*', which seems to indicate that he was aware of the correct reading in 61.9 above, and that the origin of the reading '*in actu*' found there is to be sought in the MS-tradition of the *Commentary,* as a copyist's error, rather than in the translation.

79.19-23. In the corresponding Greek text (212a 7-14) Aristotle remarks that place seems to be something great and difficult to grasp, both because matter and shape appear along with it, and because the displacement of the thing moved occurs in a stationary container; for it seems there could be something in between different from the quantities in motion. 'The air', comments Aristotle, 'contributes something to this belief, since it appears to be incorporeal; for place appears to be not only the boundaries of the vessel, but also what is in between, considered as empty'.

In commenting on this passage Grosseteste points out that the surface (of the container) cannot of itself be said to possess three dimensions, but it related to three-dimensionality by being referred to what it contains within is and what surrounds it. Dimensions refer always and essentially to bodies, whence it follows that place cannot of its nature be emptied of body. Here Grosseteste appeals to the words of Aristotle italicised above his note: *proficit autem aliquid id est apparens* etc., and explains

them thus: 'that is, *it appears that* such a space is a place, which of its nature is incorporeal, different that is to say from body and the magnitude of body' (because of itself it lacks dimensions).

The misunderstanding of the Aristotelean text here employed is evidently total. It is explained by the simple finding that, of the three MSS of the commentary, *M* and *V* have '*et est apparens*', *D* has '*id est apparens*', while the Greek text reads καὶ ὁ ἀ῎ηρ δοκῶν, which the *Translatio Vetus* faithfully renders '*et aer apparens*'. Evidently *aer* became corrupted to *est* in the Ms tradition, and by a seductive rationalisation *D* extended *est* into *id est* (*apparens*). The fault therefore did not lie with the translation itself, but with its textual tradition. The corruption affected no chief doctrine of Aristotle, it merely enticed Grosseteste into making some kind of sense of the dialectical passage in which it occurs; and this he achieved according to the best Aristotelean principles.

Despite a thorough search of the commentary, I have been unable to uncover other misinterpretations of Aristotle which are attribuable to inaccuracies in the translation. The conclusion of this inquiry must then be, that mistakes in translation occur only infrequently in the texts quoted by Grosseteste. In no case of his reliance upon the Latin version was he seriously misled concerning a fundamental point of Aristotelean doctrine, though it did occur on one occasion that a discussion of Aristotle's lost part of its point due to an inaccuracy in the translation. No doubt many passages of the frequently obscure book which is the *Physics* of Aristotle were rendered even more unclear in the Latin version than they had been in the original; certainly, too, a firsthand acquaintance with the Greek text would have permitted a clearer grasp of many of the finer points of argumentation and a greater sureness of interpretation; nevertheless, we must admit that Grosseteste understood the text and the mind of Aristotle with remarkable clarity, though the Latin version was, practically speaking, his sole guide. This is a great tribute to his intelligence.

The following is the list of references to the passages of the *Physics* which are quoted by Grosseteste in his commentary. They have been worked out on the basis of MS *Vatican Urbinat. lat. 206* (cf. the Appendix to Dales's edition of the *Commentary*, pp. 161-183). The first number refers to the page and line of Dales' edition, the second to the text of Aristotle. I have used Ross's edition of the Greek text.

BOOK I A

5.19-20[9]	=	184a 26 - 184b 10
5.24	=	184b 11
5.28-29	=	184b 20 - 22
6.2-3	=	184b 24 - 25
6.6-7	=	185a 12 - 13

(9) The first reference in each case is to Grosseteste's *Commentary on the Physics*, the second to the Greek text of the *Physics*.

6.8-10	=	185a 20 - 22
6.27	=	185a 20 - 21
8.10-11	=	185b 7 - 8
9.20	=	185b 22 - 23
10.1	=	185b 25 - 26
10.20	=	186a 4
10.23	=	186a 5 - 6
12.1	=	186a 12 - 13
12.12	=	186a 13
12.18	=	186a 22
14.10	=	186b 12
14.23-24	=	186b 35
14.25	=	187a 3 - 4
14.30-31	=	187a 6 - 8
18.8-9	=	188a 19
18.28-29	=	188a 26 - 27
19.21	=	188b 9
20.1-2	=	189a 8 - 10
20.6	=	189a 11 - 12
23.18	=	189b 16
23.19-20	=	189b 18
24.5-6	=	189b 28 - 29
24.11	=	191a 3
25.15	=	191a 23 - 24
28.9	=	191b 35

BOOK II B

31.1	=	related to 197a 34 - 35
32.4-5	=	192b 20 - 23
33.10	=	192b 32 - 33
33.14-16	=	192b 35
33.23	=	193a 3
33.30	=	193a 9 - 10
35.27-28	=	193b 3 - 5
35.31	=	193b 23
39.25	=	195a 3 - 4
40.13-14	=	195a 4 - 5
40.22-23	=	195a 8 - 9
41.8-9	=	195a 11 - 13
41.10-11	=	195a 15 - 16
42.2-3	=	195b 16 - 18
42.5-7	=	195b 21 - 22 and 24 - 25
42.8	=	195b 31
42.18-19	=	related to 197a 34-35
42.24		seems to refer to a section: 195b 36 - 196b 9, where Aristotle shows that the existence of chance was, however confusedly, recognised by his prede-

cessors; having thus established its existence, he will in what follows examine its nature.

43.25-26	=	197a 5 - 6
44.9-10	=	197b 13 - 15
44.12-13	=	198a 9 - 10
46.10	=	197b 22
46.25-26	=	198a 10 - 11
46.30	=	198a 14
46.32-47.1	=	198a 22
47.6-7	=	199a 7 - 8
47.17	=	199a 33

BOOK III Γ

48.1	=	200b 12
48.22-23	=	201a 10 - 11
49.24-25	=	201b 31 - 32
50.17-19	=	202a 3 - 5
51.6-7	=	202a 5 - 6
51.11	=	202a 9
51.18	=	202a 18
53.12-13	=	202b 30, 34 - 35
57.4-5[10]	=	203a 16 - 18
57.7-8	=	203a 19 - 20
57.23-24	=	203a 27 - 28
57.25-26	=	203a 31 - 32
57.30-31	=	203b 4
59.7	=	203b 30 - 31
61.7-8	=	204b 1 - 3
61.9	=	204b 3 - 4
61.10-11	=	204b 5 - 6
61.25-28		cf. Wisdom 8,1.
63.25	=	205a 7 - 8
65.5	=	205b 1 - 2
65.19-20	=	205b 24 - 25
65.20-21	=	205b 26
66.6-8	=	206a 7 - 10
68.23-24	=	206b 33 - 34
69.21-23	=	207a 10 - 12
69.29	=	207b 1 - 2
70.23-24	=	206a 9 - 10
70.24-25	=	208a 5

---

(10) The words '*super illam litteram*' indicate that the text of Aristotle is quoted here; the correspondence is verbal.

BOOK IV Δ

71.1-2	=	208a 27 - 28
71.17-18	=	208b 8 - 9
71.27	=	208b 29
72.23	=	209a 4 - 5
72.28-73.1-2	=	209a 6 - 7
73.7-8	=	209a 7 - 8
73.23-24	=	209a 24
74.1	=	209b 2
74.28-29	=	209b 21 - 22
75.7-8	=	210a 14 - 15
75.9-10	=	210b 21 - 22
76.1	=	210b 22 - 23
76.28	=	211a 6
77.3-4	=	211a 23 - 24
77.19-20	=	211a 29 - 30
77.27-28	=	211b 18
77.32-33	=	211b 11 - 12
79.6	=	211b 29 - 30
79.11	=	212a 7
79.20-21	=	212a 12
79.23	=	212a 13
80.2	=	212a 20
82.28-29	=	212a 21 - 22
83.1-2	=	212a 31 - 32
83.3-4	=	212a 34
83.22-23	=	212b 29 - 30
84.12-13	=	214b 12
85.1-2	=	216a 23 - 24
85.5	=	216a 26
85.20	=	216b 22
86.7	=	217b 11
86.17	=	217b 29
86.18	=	217b 32 - 33
86.20-21	=	218b 5 - 6
86.22-23	=	219a 1 - 2
86.26-27		I cannot place this phrase in the Greek text.
86.30	=	219a 1
90.2	=	219b 7 - 8
90.18-19	=	219b 7 - 8
97.23	=	219b 9
98.21	=	219b 33 - 220a 1
99.1-2	=	220a 4 - 5
99.14-15	=	220a 18 - 20
99.30-31	=	220a 30 - 32
100.12	=	220a 32 - 220b 1
100.26	=	220b 5 - 6

101.3-4	=	220b 12 - 14
101.14	=	220b 14 - 16
101.20	=	221a 7 - 8
102.7-8	=	221a 26 - 27
102.20-21	=	221a 28
102.28	=	221b 3 - 4
103.1	=	221b 7
103.9	=	221b 20 - 21
103.12-13	=	221b 23
103.32-104.1	=	222a 10, 11 - 12, 222b 2 - 3
104.9-10	=	222b 25 - 26
104.11-13	=	222b 30 - 31
105.6	=	223b 18 - 19

BOOK V E

106.1	=	224a 21
106.20-22	=	224b 4 - 6
108.1-2	=	224b 16 - 17
108.3	=	224b 26 - 27
108.14-15	=	225a 7 - 8
108.17-18	=	225a 25
109.11	=	225a 26 - 27
109.14	=	225a 34
109.17	=	225b 5
109.25	=	226b 26
109.28-29	=	227a 13 - 14
110.7-8	=	227a 17 - 18
110.8-9	=	227a 18 - 20
110.10	=	227a 21
110.11	=	227a 23 - 24
110.12-13	=	227b 4 - 5
110.15-16	=	227b 21 - 22
110.27-111.1	=	227b 29
113.11	=	228a 20 - 21
113.22	=	228b 19
114.16	=	229a 30 - 31
114.16-17	=	229a 32
114.20	=	229b 29 - 30
114.26	=	229b 31 - 32
114.29-30	=	230a 7 - 8
115.5	=	230a 31 - 32

BOOK VI Z

116.1	=	231a 21
116.7-8	=	231a 24
116.10-11	=	231b 6 - 7

116.22-25	=	231b 15 - 16, 18 - 19
117.3	=	232a 23
117.3-4	=	232a 25 - 26
117.11-12	=	232b 24 - 25
117.14	=	233a 31 - 32
117.21-22	=	233b 15 - 16
117.26	=	233b 33
118.1	=	233b 34
118.3	=	234a 24
118.6	=	234a 31 - 32
118.8	=	234b 10
118.10	=	234b 25 - 26
118.13-14	=	235b 6 - 7
119.1	=	235b 32 - 33
119.4-5	=	236a 13 - 15
119.8-9	=	236a 26 - 27
119.13-14	=	236b 8 - 9
119.17	=	236b 20
119.17-18	=	236b 22
119.21-22	=	236b 32 - 34
119.24-26	=	237b 23 - 25
119.28-29	=	238a 20 - 21
119.32-120.1	=	238a 32 - 33
120.5	=	238b 13 - 14
120.13-14	=	238b 26 - 27
120.23-24	=	238b 24 - 25
121.31-32	=	238b 31 - 32
122.5-6	=	238b 36 - 239a 1
122.9-10	=	239a 8 - 9
122.10-11	=	239a 23
122.11-12	=	239a 25 - 26
122.17-18	=	240a 19 - 20
124.8-9	=	240b 8 - 9

BOOK VII H

125.1	=	241b 34
125.9	=	242a 37 - 38
125.10	=	242a 49 - 50
125.27	=	242a 52 - 54
126.26-27	=	243a 32 - 33
127.8-9	=	245b 3 - 4
127.9-10	=	244a 8 - 9
127.17	=	243a 17 - 18
127.18	=	243b 8 or 11
127.22-23		I cannot place this phrase in the Greek text.
128.8-9	=	244b 5b - 5c
128.9-13		cf. *De Gen. et Corr.* 329b 5 - 10
128.14-15	=	247b 19 - 248a 1

BOOK VIII Θ

131.1	=	250b 11
131.4-6	=	252b 5 - 6
131.12-13	=	261a 27 - 28
131.15-16	=	261a 31 - 32
131.19	=	265a 13 - 14
132.1	=	266a 10
132.2-4	=	252a 11 - 13
132.11	=	252a 27 - 28
132.20	=	252b 12 - 13
132.27	=	253a 28 - 29
134.23-24	=	254b 24 - 26
135.17-19	=	255a 10 - 12
136.24-25	=	256b 27 - 29
137.18-20	=	257a 27 - 29
140.13	=	257b 17
140.28	=	257b 17 - 18
142.7	=	257b 32 - 33
142.27	=	258a 5
143.25	=	258a 20
143.26	=	258a 27 - 28
144.14	=	258a 27 - 28
147.19-149.7	=	paraphrase and résumé of Aristotle's argumentation in *Physics* 251a 8 - 251b 10
148.13-14		does not seem to occur in the text of the *Physics* as such, but to be a paraphrase of Aristotle's thought in 151a 17 - 20, to which it is closely related.
149.9-10		is a paraphrase of 250b 11.
150.22-151.4		is a résumé of *Phys.* VIII 251a 23 - 251b 13.
151.14-19		summarises *Phys.* 251b 19 - 28
151.20-21		represents a paraphrase of *Phys.* 251b 20 - 22.
152.20-21	=	252b 5 - 6

James Mc Evoy,
Department of Scholastic Philosophy,
Queen's University,
Belfast 7,
N. Ireland.